

AD-A239 999



MEMORANDUM REPORT BRL-MR-3930

BRL

A PROPOSED METHOD FOR INCORPORATING
BALLISTIC SHOCK EFFECTS IN
VULNERABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSES

JAMES N. WALBERT

AUGUST 1991



APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION IS UNLIMITED.

U.S. ARMY LABORATORY COMMAND

BALLISTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MARYLAND

91 0 00 00

91-09337



NOTICES

Destroy this report when it is no longer needed. DO NOT return it to the originator.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from the National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161.

The findings of this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

The use of trade names or manufacturers' names in this report does not constitute indorsement of any commercial product.

UNCLASSIFIED

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
<small>Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.</small>				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE August 1991	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Progress, Oct 90 - Mar 91		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE A Proposed Method for Incorporating Ballistic Shock Effects in Vulnerability/Lethality Analyses		5. FUNDING NUMBERS PE: 665805.620		
6. AUTHOR(S) James N. Walbert				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory ATTN: SLCBR-DD-T Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066		10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER BRL-MR-3930		
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.		12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE		
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) This report describes a proposed method for modeling ballistic shock effects in vulnerability/lethality analyses. A novel approach is described which, under certain simplifying assumptions, can be implemented in a manner entirely compatible with the existing analytical environment.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Ballistic shock, vulnerability, nonpenetrating impact, impact shock, terminal ballistics, structural response		15. NUMBER OF PAGES 43		16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR	

UNCLASSIFIED

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
1. BACKGROUND	1
2. INTRODUCTION	2
3. THE USES OF BALLISTIC SHOCK DATA	8
4. AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL TECHNIQUES	9
5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	16
6. REFERENCES	19
DISTRIBUTION LIST	21



Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification _____	
By _____	
Distribution/ _____	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is indebted to a great many people at the U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory (BRL) who have given of their time and expertise in helping me formulate my ideas. Thanks to Don Petty and Sue Coates for producing the generic computer target descriptions. Also, thanks to Ed Davisson, Dan Kirk, and Ennis Quigley for their review and comments. A special thanks to Bob Kirby and Mike Starks for their thoughtful input and patient dialogue with me while I developed the concepts in this report.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

1. BACKGROUND

The problem of determining loss of armored vehicle combat utility from shock historically has taken a back seat to other problems in vulnerability science for two reasons. First, the problem is quite difficult to solve. Second, the effects of shock have been considered as secondary in their contributions to loss of combat utility to other effects such as penetration and spall. Clearly, the first reason is insignificant if the second reason is valid. The second reason is based on historical perspective which comes from a biased sample. In particular, the overwhelming majority of attacking munitions, the effects of which have been studied in live fire or other tests, have as their main defeat mechanism the perforation or attempted perforation of armor. Given this set of observations, it is not surprising that penetration and spall are the primary observed defeat mechanisms. One strongly suspects that had the majority of tests consisted of subjecting combat vehicles to dunking in water, the primary mechanism by which loss of combat utility occurred would have been observed to be water damage. The contention is, therefore, that the second reason is invalid due to its basis in a biased sample. One could also assert that most anti-combat vehicle munitions attempt to perforate armor, and so the bias is acceptable. While this may or may not track reasonably well with history, it most certainly takes the short view of the future. The "tougher armor/better bullet" race is in many instances taking a back seat to a "smarter armor/smarter bullet" race. Specifically, many armors are designed not for toughness, but rather for sophistication in the manner in which they use natural material properties to prevent perforation. At the same time, one notes a growth in interest in fast, big bullets that smash, as well as perforate.

These smart armors will distribute shock loads to the vehicle in quite a different manner than monolithic or solid layered armors. By the same token, fast, heavy bullets may use a greater portion of their total energy to impart shock to the vehicle than, say, a conventional kinetic energy (KE) round, which makes more of a "surgical incision" into the armor. Thus, one suspects that understanding and modeling shock effects will be of increasing importance to the vulnerability/lethality community. We come now to the first reason given as to why shock effects are not modeled, namely, the difficulty of the problem. In the annals of vulnerability science, the Canadian Armament Research and Development Establishment (CARDE) trials are considered as the dawn of the age of enlightenment. From the data acquired at these trials came confidence in certain vulnerability rules of thumb such as profile

hole diameter being correlated to loss of combat utility. Shock effects are less easily and naturally measured or observed, and may in fact be overlooked since they are not necessarily on or near an observed "shot line." It has been pointed out to the author that defenders of the CARDE methods would argue that shock effects are included implicitly in the profile hole diameter correlations. While this is certainly true, such implicit inclusions must be taken in the context of the type of target vehicles used in the CARDE trials. These M47 and M48 tanks were devoid of modern, sophisticated (and delicate) fire control hardware, so one would not expect shock to have been a significant contributor to the observed damage. Extrapolation to more modern systems from the CARDE data has been a point of great concern to vulnerability analysts precisely because those CARDE targets bear less and less resemblance to modern reality with each new tank that goes into production. In short, there is the potential for a good deal more shock damage in modern combat vehicles, to components which did not appear in the CARDE targets. One cannot presume the profile hole diameter correlations to retain the implicit inclusion of shock effects they once may have had. In the absence of such handy correlations between shock effects and other observed phenomena, one presumes that some sort of mathematical model is required to explain observed events. Conventional wisdom in solving shock and vibration problems is to construct a highly detailed geometric representation of the structure and model its shock transmission characteristics as accurately and with as much detail as possible. To say that this process is difficult is to make a classic understatement.

2. INTRODUCTION

In what follows is proposed a program to model shock and its effect in armored vehicles which builds on simplistic assumptions and provides for increased sophistication as knowledge and capability permit. There are three parts to the program:

- (1) model the modal response of the structure of interest, and determine the significant loading parameters;
- (2) determine the specific response of the structure to a specific loading function;
- (3) correlate the specific response to specific loss of function.

Attempting to solve part 1 is the point at which most attempts falter, making part 2 even more difficult, thus preventing one from ever getting to part 3. Consequently, what is proposed is a simplified approach to part 1, recognizing the possible inherent inaccuracies, in order to come eventually to grips with part 3.

The fundamental simplification is to abandon (at least initially) any attempt to model a specific combat vehicle precisely and in detail by finite elements or other engineering means. Instead, it is proposed that a small set of very simple geometric shapes be modeled by finite elements; these shapes can be assembled to represent generically a large class of combat vehicles, and full- and sub-scale tests can be performed to compare with model output. For example, Figure 1 depicts a set of six shapes from which one can construct a fairly large set of "generic" combat vehicles. In Figure 2a-b are shown an Abrams Tank and a Soviet Main Battle Tank, in very simplistic form. In Figure 3a-d are shown an M113 Armored Personnel Carrier, an LAV-25, a Bradley Fighting Vehicle (BFV), and a Soviet BMP, each with considerably more fidelity than those of Figure 2, yet still quite simple. Once confidence is gained in the ability to model shock propagation in these simple, "generic" combat vehicles, details such as hatch openings can be added. While this problem is considerably easier than that of precise, detailed modeling of a specific armored combat vehicle, it is by no means simple. Perhaps conspicuous by its absence is any mention of shock effects in aircraft. While there is no reason why the methods outlined in this paper could not be applied to an airframe, they are geared more toward ground combat systems the "skin" (armored shell) of which is tough enough to transmit significant energy to components prior to its own failure. More simply stated, ballistic shock is perceived to be more of a problem in ground combat vehicles than in aircraft.

Of course, the most important questions for BRL's Vulnerability/Lethality Division (VLD) are concerned with how this simplified shock response model output relates to damage which affects combat utility, in either a generic or a specific system. Indeed, defining this relationship may be the hardest part of the entire shock problem, since there are no well-defined engineering guidelines and since the relationship between shock response and loss of combat utility is quite different from that between, say, penetrator/shot line and loss of combat utility. There are several reasons for this difference, which are important to understand if one is to make any sense at all of the ballistic shock problem.






Figure 1. Basic Geometric Shapes for Generic Combat Vehicles.




(a) Abrams Tank




(b) Soviet Main Battle Tank


Figure 2. Generic Heavy Armored Vehicles.




(a) M113 Armored Personnel Carrier



(c) Bradley Fighting Vehicle



(b) LAV-25



(d) Soviet BMP

Figure 3. Generic Light Armored Vehicles.

Deitz and Ozolins (1988) have divided the vulnerability/lethality assessment process into four spaces: Space 1 is the weapon/target interaction; Space 2 is the resulting damage; Space 3 is the loss of capability (or, measure of performance space); and Space 4 is the loss of utility (or, measure of effectiveness space). Where the ballistic shock problem differs from other vulnerability/lethality problems is in the way shock maps from Space 1 to Space 2. Specifically, when a KE projectile strikes a vehicle along a specific shot line, one expects and can observe damage to be generally along and in a region about this shot line as defined by the spall cone. The current VLD analytical methods will use either a lumped- parameter or a point-burst type model and associated geometric model-querying techniques such as ray tracing to "look along" the shot line and estimate damage, producing a damage state vector in Space 2. In the case of ballistic shock, damage may occur at any point in the vehicle, perhaps far from the "shot line," if indeed a shot line even exists (which it does not in the case of attack by fuel/air explosives [FAE], for example). Moreover, shock damage may not be observable in immediate proximity to the hit; the damage in an actual test event may be neither immediately obvious nor easily located. Consider, for example, a radio which fails to function during post-shot assessment of a combat vehicle. If there are no "holes" in the radio from penetrator or spall, it is not immediately clear whether the radio has suffered internal shock damage, or whether some critical connector or electrical line elsewhere in the vehicle has been compromised (by shock, spall, fire, or other means). Shock damage also is subject to stochastic variations just as other Space 2 vector components are. One need only consider cases from personal observation of fragile items which were dropped but did not break to gain insight on this point.

It is clear, then, that shot line-type mappings from Space 1 to Space 2 are not well suited to address ballistic shock phenomena. The fundamental problem addressed by the methods proposed here is how to construct a mapping from Space 1 to Space 2. No attempt will be made to dictate how one should go from Space 2 to Space 4. Indeed, for some uses of ballistic shock modeling described in the next section, Space 2 is the correct and final analytical domain. For other uses, it may be desirable to formulate a histogram showing frequency of expected losses-of-function. But the reader should bear in mind that because the exact nature of the correlation (if it exists) between shock damage and other mechanisms is unknown, combining shock effects with others in any space higher than Space 2 is quite probably mathematically incorrect. In particular, there is no proper way to combine a

shock Pk with some other Pk. From this perspective, VLD is left with a considerable amount of effort before being able to include shock damage in routine vulnerability or lethality analyses. The remainder of this paper focuses on possible solutions to the problems cited above, and addresses the question of how accurate such analytical techniques are likely to be.

3. THE USES OF BALLISTIC SHOCK DATA

Before discussing solution techniques for the ballistic shock problem, it would be appropriate to delineate the various needs for such techniques within VLD, since the specific needs should determine the analytical approach and output. Indeed, it will be shown that the proposed solution techniques are adaptable to the broad range of applications in the Division, and that there are natural levels at which one may "tap" the process to extract required information. With this in mind, these uses are presented in ascending order of required detail, as opposed to order of priority of need.

The least technically demanding use (level 1) is in the early stages of vehicle design where considerations of size, shape, and weight are undergoing trade-off studies with operational requirements and desired capabilities. One may find, for example, that a turret of one shape is operationally equivalent to one of a different shape, but one of the two candidates provides greater inherent mitigation of shock effects because of its shape. The next most technically demanding use (level 2) is in the study of vehicle design for reduced vulnerability. Generic questions such as where best to locate fuel cells, fire control computers, sighting systems, etc., can be addressed at least in part by knowing which vehicle locations are most or least susceptible to structural deformation under shock loading. The next most technically demanding (level 3) use is for inclusion of shock effects in the total lethality of a munition. Wishing to give as much credit as possible and appropriate to an attacking munition for damage caused to a combat vehicle is a primary concern of the VLD. Similarly, noting shock sensitivity of a vehicle is an important part of vulnerability studies. Finally, the most technically demanding (level 4) use is in the design of individual components and mounts, to include crew seating and restraints, where the advantage of full knowledge of expected structural response to shock loading is clear.

It is anticipated that the proposed techniques can be used successfully to address levels 1 and 2 in the near term with medium risk, and that the third level can be successfully addressed next with medium/high risk. The question of whether the fourth level can be addressed by these techniques will in great part be determined by the amount of detail which can be incorporated into the basic structural models and the fidelity with which they capture the actual vehicle response. It must also be noted that these techniques are not likely to be useful in instances where shock effects are quite small compared to other damage mechanisms. Rather, these methods are an attempt to evaluate shock effects in the case where they are one of the major, if not the only, damage mechanism present. There are many such examples from recent live fire tests, and as the spectrum of so-called antiarmor munitions grows, there are apt to be many more such examples. As the ability to model responses of complex structures improves, so too will the ability to include smaller shock effects.

4. AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL TECHNIQUES

The exact details of how one determines the (modal) response of the generic structures in Figures 2 and 3 are not within the purview of this report, but there are a number of assumptions concerning the input to and output from such a procedure which are necessarily a part of the overall analytical effort. The basic scheme is to model the structure to determine its range of response frequencies (modes), and then to use finite element or other engineering techniques to determine the specific response at any point on the structure to a particular loading function. While easily stated, for all but the simplest of structures this scheme is difficult to implement. The sensitivity of the output of such a model to changes in the loading function will play a large role in determining the utility of that output in a vulnerability/lethality analysis. For instance, one would like the model to be able to distinguish response to a blast mine under the vehicle from response due to the impact of a KE projectile into the turret front. One suspects that the energy deposited and time duration for that deposition should be significant parameters. Given the simple generic structures posed for the problem, it is not clear that the process need be as sensitive to location of loading as it is to type of loading. It may be that no distinction has to be made between right side hull front and right side hull rear, but more can be said about this once a model is operational.

In terms of output, the expectation for the response model is that given a loading function, one should be able to plot response vs time at any of the first few modes of vibration for any given point on the structure. It might also be desirable to have output in the form of color-coded graphics, so one could note the locations of maximum (amplitude) response. Such output would be especially useful for basic design studies (levels 1 and 2), where one could determine those vehicle locations at which to avoid placing shock sensitive items or perhaps recommend a less shock sensitive structural shape.

The next step in shock analysis, once the response of the generic structure to a specific loading function at a specific point has been computed, is to identify within the actual combat vehicle those components which are both critical to vehicle function and likely to be sensitive to the anticipated shock levels. There is clearly a good deal of subjectivity (perhaps one should say engineering insight and vulnerability/lethality analysis experience) in such an identification process, but for a tank one would immediately list each crew member and any components containing glass associated with vision and/or fire control. Actual test data would dictate additions to this list for specific red or blue systems, but the basic task is to establish "where to look" for shock damage. There should be no expectations that the analyst will be able to identify all shock-sensitive components in advance, nor should it be anticipated that every shock-sensitive component is critical to vehicle mission. For example, a radio mounting bolt broken by shock will not necessarily keep the radio from functioning. Once these "significant" components have been identified, their locations in the actual vehicle (that is, the points in the actual vehicle to which each of these components is attached) must be mapped to a corresponding location in the generic structure for which the shock response has been computed. While specific (x,y,z) coordinate mappings are not likely to be possible, if the generic shapes have been appropriately scaled then reasonable locale mappings, perhaps using computer overlays of the actual target description with the generic structure, can be made. At this stage of the analysis, one could get an indication of whether the component identified as being susceptible to shock was actually subjected (or rather, had its attachment point actually subjected) to any structural deformation, and at what level. It should be noted that the term structural deformation refers to any possible combination of transient motion and permanent bending/breaking.

The next step in the process (to address uses in upper level 2 and beyond) is to analyze the response of the component given the motion of its mount or attachment point. In certain rare (quite probably nonexistent) instances, one may have the luxury of a detailed study of mount/component responses for a given system, and perhaps even extensive shock testing of components. Such data are especially unlikely for red systems, and the expense of such testing on blue systems is prohibitive. While there have been extensive tests done on Abrams tank components, the author believes these tests were a onetime offering, never to be repeated. This means, of course, that analysis must be used in lieu of testing, although there has been a good deal of structural response data recorded during live fire and other tests. What is suggested here is that one presume that "a driver's seat is pretty much the same" in terms of how it passes shock along to the passenger no matter which vehicle it's in. Certainly, the angle the driver makes with the horizontal axis of the vehicle contributes to the severity of any vertical accelerations to which this member of the crew is subjected, but resolution of vector components is not an overly taxing matter. There are a number of criteria (GADD Severity Index, Head Injury Criterion, etc.) which have been developed over the years to deal with levels of incapacitation once the acceleration levels are known.

A similar analysis of inert components such as those containing glass is less straightforward, but can be simplified if certain assumptions are made. The most basic of these concerns the question of which frequencies cause the greatest damage (or possibly, are most often the cause of damage)—the high modes or the low modes. A word of caution—a low mode of vibration for a small object could be a "high" frequency on some absolute scale, while a low mode of vibration for a large structure could be at quite a "low" frequency on that same scale. The point of this discussion is that the structural model based on the simplified assumptions suggested in this report will have its greatest fidelity to the actual vehicle in the lower modes of vibration. These lower modes are in fact the frequencies which have the most energy associated with them. Given these facts, one must make an analysis of component response based on what can happen to the component when subjected to what for it may be relatively low frequencies with perhaps significant amounts of energy contained in them. That damage can occur at relatively low frequencies has many common examples, but the following will illustrate the point nicely. In a rather well-known television commercial, a singer hit an appropriate high-frequency note and a glass shattered. Now, one could also break the glass by subjecting it to its own first mode of vibration (a low frequency), that is,

simply bend it. Simple torque will also work—twisting the stem until it breaks. If our analysis shows that the component will fail at a relatively low frequency, the question of whether it also would have failed due to high frequency content of the same loading function is moot.

Clearly, what such analysis will fail to detect is failure of components through relatively high frequencies beyond the range of the structural model. A more relevant example might be the case of a driver's hatch in a tank which opens as a result of a munition impact. The hatch may function perfectly after the test event, and there may be no signs of permanent structural deformation in the vicinity of the hatch. The explanation would be that transient (low-frequency) shock-induced bending of the surrounding structure was sufficient to release the hatch. No "damage" is observable, and accelerometers in the vicinity of the hatch are unlikely to have recorded the low-frequency culprit. This last point is important, because it suggests, intentionally, that shock data previously collected was biased toward the higher frequencies and may therefore not provide full information. One of the advantages of the velocity gage developed by Walton (1989) at the Combat Systems Test Activity, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, is that it has the potential to record reliably structural response at frequencies lower than accelerometers.

The discussion in the previous paragraph is central to the entire concept of shock modeling. The extent to which one can rely on low modes to represent shock transmission through the structure is directly related to the level of detail required in the finite element or structural engineering model. The concept outlined above is one with which there is likely to be a great deal of disagreement; it represents a departure from conventional wisdom on the subject of ballistic shock, which is to seek a high degree of detailed structural fidelity in the model. One cannot treat propagation of high frequencies without a highly detailed model, so the two go hand in hand. It is important to understand the nature of what is being proposed here. First, it is not intended that high frequencies be disregarded, nor is it proposed that there should never be a high-resolution model to work from for ballistic shock analysis. What is important is that the problem is approached in a building-block fashion. Having a highly detailed finite element model of some combat vehicle is great, but possessing that model is to understanding ballistic shock as having one entry from a table of logarithms is to understanding the log function. Specifically, even if one could do a complete and accurate ballistic shock analysis (by luck or by intelligence) using this detailed finite element model, how does that help study ballistic shock effects in, say, something like a future Soviet tank?

It doesn't, unless one understands the basic principles behind shock propagation and damage.

As a second point, this concerning high vs low frequencies, one must be very careful about the interpretation and use of two parameters—loading function and energy dissipation. The high-frequency, high-energy components are, it is true, produced by short-duration loads such as that from a shaped-charge jet. But the greatest shock damage to an armored vehicle will be that induced by the impact of the warhead/flight body on the vehicle, and while the jet is short duration, warhead impact is of considerably longer duration. The high frequencies induced by a shaped charge jet or even a KE penetrator are dissipated rapidly in the nonlinear stresses local to the point of impact. Large massive structures such as cast turrets or heavy armors are excellent low-pass energy filters; the more linear, globally transmitted shock has more energy in the lower frequencies. The saving feature about the method proposed in this report is that it is a milestone along the path to the highest possible fidelity of shock modeling, and as such can be evaluated and accepted or rejected with minimal perturbation to the long-term research work.

There are additional factors which favor a low-detail, low-frequency approach to the problem of component shock damage. First, while a comprehensive shock testing program on components is highly desirable, it is also cost prohibitive, in both dollars and equipment. There simply are not enough Abrams fire control computers in the world to perform all of the shock, spall fragment, and penetration testing to characterize totally their vulnerability, and still maintain an operational fleet. One must make do with partial testing, analysis, and good old-fashioned engineering judgement. Further, any method for predicting ballistic shock effects which relies heavily on component testing will be of limited use in studies of future U.S. systems, whose components are not yet defined, and in foreign future and present systems. In short, if the approach to the shock problem relies on highly detailed testing and analysis, the general problem remains unsolvable.

If one accepts (or at least fails to reject immediately) the concept that low-frequency (and "low" is still relative) shock damage is important to study, then it turns out that several other simplifications fall nicely into place. First and foremost of these is the question of how shock is transmitted from the vehicle structure to a component through its mount. For the most part,

shock mounting of components is done to protect them from the high-frequency content of normal road shock and vibration as simulated on shaker tables; the lower frequencies are not generally compensated for except by the suspension system, which changes them rather than removing them. Because the mass of any component is much less than the mass of the turret or hull to which it is attached, low frequency motion of the component will be virtually identical to the motion of its attachment point. That is, analysis of shock damage by the methods proposed here will not require extensive information about component mounting; one may assume that the component will undergo the same motion at the same (low) frequencies as the basic vehicle structure. While there may be some phase delay, especially where crew are concerned, amplitudes should not differ significantly. It is also possible, as will be discussed further on in this report, to mitigate the effects of the lack of detailed knowledge about component and mount responses by using Monte-Carlo techniques.

With all these assumptions in place, one can look toward a general method of assessment and/or analysis. By superimposing a color-coded generic vehicle shape on the full computer target description and thus identifying areas/components for further study, the target description query problem is resolved. By using the existing database of accelerometer and velocity gage information together with damage assessment records and component testing already accomplished, it should be a relatively straightforward process to develop, for each system of interest, a list of shock-sensitive critical components. From the same existing data, rules of thumb relating shock levels to component damage can be formulated. These rules are envisioned as step functions relating the states killed/not killed to some parameter such as maximum amplitude in the response curve in each of the first five modes. The final output of a shock damage analysis will be a Space 2 shock damage state vector, with binary vector components. This vector must then be combined with damage state vectors from other mechanisms (spall, penetrator, etc.) to produce a final Space 2 vector. The process of combining these vectors is certainly nontrivial unless there is true phenomenological independence, which is at best doubtful. Nevertheless, use of the inclusive-or seems quite appropriate. That is, anything damaged by shock or penetrator or spall should be included in the damage state vector as being damaged; no extra credit is given for anything damaged by more than one mechanism, and of course no credit is given for anything not damaged by any mechanism.

From the Space 2 damage vector, one can proceed along any of the variety of paths available to vulnerability analysts, from Standard Damage Assessment List (SDAL)/Damage Assessment List (DAL) Pk computation (Zeller and Armendt 1987) to degraded states (Starks 1988). It is important to reiterate that the proposed process does not recommend computation of a "shock Pk" to combine with some other Pk. To do so would put a far more severe strain on mathematical credibility than the inclusive-or process. Moreover, as Starks has so eloquently pointed out (Starks 1988), computation of quantities like a shock Pk tends to destroy the audit trail, and brings repeatability of results into serious question. Finally, a binary-type damage state vector is more readily and directly compared with field trials. That the software tools to perform such analyses can be developed in a manner consistent with current techniques (Hanes et al., to be published) within the VLD is not in doubt. By divorcing the shock analysis from both the lumped-parameter and the point-burst models, while retaining the same type of operating environment and damage state vector output, the greatest level of analytical flexibility is retained. Moreover, the purpose of the present work is essentially a first cut at a mapping from Space 1 to Space 2. As knowledge increases, a more complete analytical framework may evolve.

Reference has already been made to the stochastic nature of shock propagation and effects. The VLD has long recognized the propriety of stochastic methods of analysis (Ozolins 1988). The proposed shock analysis methods described here lend themselves naturally to the accommodation of Monte-Carlo techniques. For example, for the initial loading on the finite element structural model, one could vary parameters such as location, duration, impact velocity, and mass (assuming a sensitivity analysis reveals these to be significant). One could further vary structural stiffnesses and material properties within the bounds of measurement, production variations, and so on. In this manner, the structural response model would produce a distribution of possible responses, together with some estimate of the likelihood of any particular response occurring. From this point in the analysis, one could introduce further stochasticism by varying, for example, the amplitude of the shock levels to which crew are subjected, simulating cushioned or spring-mounted seats. It is entirely possible that the shock response of certain components could be so well characterized that fail/no fail probability distributions could be determined for given shock levels. The result of such Monte-Carlo trials would be a set of possible shock damage state vectors, just as current vulnerability/lethality methods produce distributions of possible penetrator and spall damage

vectors. A potentially significant benefit of stochastic component response modeling is that it could take the place, at least initially, of detailed knowledge about mount/component shock response and interaction. As knowledge increases, the Monte-Carlo parameters can be refined, but one should be skeptical of any thoughts that stochasticism can be replaced by determinism in this process.

Finally, to address the questions of accuracy and growth potential, it should be clear that no restrictions are placed on either of these by the proposed methods. The more accurate and realistic the response model becomes, the easier it will be to superimpose it on the geometric description of the actual target. Similarly, the more that is known about component shock response, the more refined the "rules of thumb" or component shock failure algorithms can be made. A final word about simplified geometric structures. Remember that for basic vehicle design concept studies, one needs to work with those simple structures—fine detail doesn't exist at that stage. But even if such detail is available, adding it to the model at the beginning may lead to other difficulties. If the loading history cannot be "appropriately characterized," (that is, characterized to the same level of detail as the finite element model) or, if damage criteria are not sufficiently sophisticated (detailed), fidelity of results may be lost. It is far too easy to stop work on a problem in its tracks by falling into the trap of having detail in one part outrun the detail in other parts, and then proclaiming that "just as soon as we can get as much detail into all the other input as we have in the model, we can do the problem." One should not expect precise quantification of ballistic shock from the methods proposed here, but simple models and simplified input and simplified assumptions should provide both a solid starting point and internally consistent qualitative results. Ultimately, the accuracy of this type of analysis, as in all vulnerability/lethality analyses, will be gauged by the degree to which the distribution of shock damage state vectors reflects reality as it is perceived by the user.

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A general framework has been described by which ballistic shock effects on combat vehicles may be incorporated into vulnerability/lethality analyses. Based on certain simplifying assumptions and the incorporation of Monte-Carlo techniques, it has been argued that seeking a high level of detail may unnecessarily complicate the problem. It has been shown that the proposed methods fit readily into both degraded states-type analyses and more traditional

SDAL/DAL techniques. Moreover, these methods are independent of the conventional compartment, point-burst, or stochastic point-burst models, yet can be compatible in a Modular Unix-Based Vulnerability Estimation Suite (MUVES) environment with these codes. Finally, these methods are entirely consistent with increased knowledge of or level of detail in structural response computations, as well as with increased sophistication in vulnerability/lethality analyses.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

6. REFERENCES

- Deitz, P. H., and A. Ozolins. "Computer Simulations of the Abrams Live Fire Field Testing." Proceedings of the Army Operations Research Symposium (AORS) XXVIII, 12-13 October, 1988.
- Hanes, P. J., S. L. Henry, G. S. Moss, K. R. Murray, and W. A. Winner. "Modular UNIX-based Vulnerability Estimation Suite (MUVES) Vulnerability Analyst's Guide." BRL report to be published.
- Ozolins, A. "Stochastic High-Resolution Vulnerability Simulation for Live Fire Programs." Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Symposium on Survivability and Vulnerability of the American Defense Preparedness Association (ADPA), 10-12 May 1988.
- Starks, M. W. "New Foundations for Tank Vulnerability Analysis." Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Symposium on Survivability and Vulnerability of the ADPA, 10-12 May 1988.
- Walton, W. S. "New Ballistic Shock Protection Requirement for Armored Combat Vehicles." Proceedings of the 60th Shock and Vibration Symposium, vol. I, 14-16 November, 1989.
- Zeller, G. A., and B. F. Armendt. "Update of the Standard Damage Assessment List for Tanks - Underlying Philosophy and Final Results." Part 1A of vol. X, Vulnerability Models, Submunition Evaluation Program, Project Chicken Little, November 1987.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

No. of
Copies Organization

- 2 Administrator
Defense Technical Info Center
ATTN: DTIC-DDA
Cameron Station
Alexandria, VA 22304-6145
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Materiel Command
ATTN: AMCDRA-ST
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333-0001
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Laboratory Command
ATTN: AMSLC-DL
2800 Powder Mill Road
Adelphi, MD 20783-1145
- 2 Commander
U.S. Army Armament Research,
Development, and Engineering Center
ATTN: SMCAR-IMI-I
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
- 2 Commander
U.S. Army Armament Research,
Development, and Engineering Center
ATTN: SMCAR-TDC
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
- 1 Director
Benet Weapons Laboratory
U.S. Army Armament Research,
Development, and Engineering Center
ATTN: SMCAR-CCB-TL
Watervliet, NY 12189-4050
- (Unclass. only)1 Commander
U.S. Army Armament, Munitions
and Chemical Command
ATTN: AMSMC-IMF-L
Rock Island, IL 61299-5000
- 1 Director
U.S. Army Aviation Research
and Technology Activity
ATTN: SAVRT-R (Library)
M/S 219-3
Ames Research Center
Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Missile Command
ATTN: AMSMI-RD-CS-R (DOC)
Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5010
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command
ATTN: ASQNC-TAC-DIT (Technical
Information Center)
Warren, MI 48397-5000
- 1 Director
U.S. Army TRADOC Analysis Command
ATTN: ATRC-WSR
White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002-5502
- 1 Commandant
U.S. Army Field Artillery School
ATTN: ATSF-CSI
Ft. Sill, OK 73503-5000
- (Class. only)1 Commandant
U.S. Army Infantry School
ATTN: ATSH-CD (Security Mgr.)
Fort Benning, GA 31905-5660
- (Unclass. only)1 Commandant
U.S. Army Infantry School
ATTN: ATSH-CD-CSO-OR
Fort Benning, GA 31905-5660
- 1 Air Force Armament Laboratory
ATTN: WL/MNOI
Eglin AFB, FL 32542-5000
- Aberdeen Proving Ground
- 2 Dir, USAMSAA
ATTN: AMXSY-D
AMXSY-MP, H. Cohen
- 1 Cdr, USATECOM
ATTN: AMSTE-TC
- 3 Cdr, CRDEC, AMCCOM
ATTN: SMCCR-RSP-A
SMCCR-MU
SMCCR-MSI
- 1 Dir, VLAMO
ATTN: AMSLC-VL-D
- 10 Dir, BRL
ATTN: SLCBR-DD-T

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Office of the Director of Defense, R&E
ATTN: Dr. William Snowden
The Pentagon, Room 3D359
Washington, DC 20301
- 1 Office of the Assistant Deputy Director
of Defense, Live Fire Testing
ATTN: COL L. Stanford
The Pentagon, Room 3E1060
Washington, DC 20301
- 9 Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency
ATTN: Mr. B. Bandy
Dr. R. Kahn
Dr. C. Kelly
Mr. P. Losleben
Dr. J. Lupo
Mr. F. Patten
Dr. Reynolds
Mr. S. Squires
COL J. Thorpe
1400 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22209
- 1 *Defense Intelligence Agency*
ATTN: DB-6E3, Jay Hagler
Washington, DC 20340-6763
- 1 Headquarters
U.S. Army Materiel Command
ATTN: AMCSCI, Dr. R. Chait
5001 Eisenhower Ave.
Alexandria, VA 22333-0001
- 1 HQDA (DAMI-FIT, COL O'Connor)
WASH DC 20310-1001
- 1 HQDA (DAMO-ZD, Mr. Riente)
The Pentagon, Room 3A538
WASH DC 20310-0410
- 1 HQDA (SARD-TN, LTC Fejfar)
The Pentagon, Room 3E360
WASH DC 20310
- 1 HQDA (Asst Chief of Staff for Intelligence,
Joseph Varandore)
WASH DC 20310-1067

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 HQDA (Limres Study Group, Shirley D. Ford)
The Pentagon, Room 1B929
WASH DC 20310
- 1 Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army
Research, Development, and Acquisition
ATTN: LTG Donald S. Pihl, Military Deputy
Washington, DC 20310-0100
- 1 Office of the Secretary of the Army
(Research, Development, and Acquisition)
ATTN: MG Cercy, Deputy for Systems
Management
Washington, DC 20310-0103
- 1 Deputy Under Secretary of the Army
for Operations Research
ATTN: SAUS-OR, Hon Walt Hollis
The Pentagon, Room 2E660
Washington, DC 20310-0102
- 2 OSD OUSD(A)
ODDDRE (T&E/LFT)
ATTN: James O'Bryon
Albert E. Rainis
The Pentagon, Room 3E1060
Washington, DC 20301-3110
- 1 Board on Army Science and Technology
National Research Council
Room MH 280
2101 Constitution Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20418
- 1 USA ETL/IAG
ATTN: Jim Campbell
Bldg. 2592, Room S16
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5546
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Foreign Science and Technology
Center
ATTN: AIAST-RA-SGI, Dr. Steven Carter
220 Seventh Ave., NE
Charlottesville, VA 22901-5396

No. of
Copies Organization

5 Commander
U.S. Army Foreign Science and Technology
Center
ATTN: Greg Crawford
Chip Grobmeyer
David P. Lutz
Suzanne Hall
Charles Hutson
220 Seventh Ave., NE
Charlottesville, VA 22901-5396

1 Commander
U.S. Army Foreign Science and Technology
Center/CA3
ATTN: Scott Mingleдорff
220 Seventh Ave., NE
Charlottesville, VA 22901-5396

1 Commander
U.S. Army Foreign Science and Technology
Center (UK)
ATTN: MAJ Nigel Williams
220 Seventh Ave., NE
Charlottesville, VA 22901-5396

1 Commander
U.S. Army Foreign Science and Technology
Center
ATTN: Dr. Tim Small
220 Seventh Ave., NE
Charlottesville, VA 22901-5396

1 Commander
U.S. Army Materiel Command
ATTN: AMCD-PI, Dan Marks
5001 Eisenhower Ave.
Alexandria, VA 22333-0001

1 Headquarters
U.S. Army Materiel Command
ATTN: AMCDRA
5001 Eisenhower Ave.
Alexandria, VA 22333-0001

1 Commander
U.S. Army Materiel Command
ATTN: AMCPD, Darold Griffin
5001 Eisenhower Ave.
Alexandria, VA 22333-0001

No. of
Copies Organization

2 Commander
U.S. Army Materiel Command
ATTN: AMCPM-LOTA,
Robert Hall
MAJ Purdin
5001 Eisenhower Ave.
Alexandria, VA 22333-0001

1 Commander
U.S. Army Materiel Command
ATTN: AMCSP
5001 Eisenhower Ave.
Alexandria, VA 22333-0001

1 Commander
U.S. Army Materiel Command
ATTN: AMCPD-PT, Alan Elkins
5001 Eisenhower Ave.
Alexandria, VA 22333-0001

1 Commander
U.S. Army Laboratory Command
ATTN: AMSLC-CT, K. Zastrow
2800 Powder Mill Road
Adelphi, MD 20783-1145

1 Commander
U.S. Army Laboratory Command
ATTN: AMSLC-CG
2800 Powder Mill Road
Adelphi, MD 20783-1145

1 Commander
U.S. Army Laboratory Command
ATTN: AMSLC-LO, LTC P. J. Fardink
2800 Powder Mill Road
Adelphi, MD 20783-1145

2 Commander
U.S. Army Laboratory Command
ATTN: AMSLC-TP,
J. Predham
D. Smith
2800 Powder Mill Road
Adelphi, MD 20783-1145

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Laboratory Command
ATTN: SLCTO, Marcos Sola
2800 Powder Mill Road
Adelphi, MD 20783-1145
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Materials Technology Laboratory
ATTN: SLCMT-ATL
Watertown, MA 02172-0001
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Armament Research,
Development, and Engineering Center
ATTN: SMCAR-CCH-V, Paul H. Gemmill
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Armament Research,
Development, and Engineering Center
ATTN: SMCAR-FSS-E, Jack Brooks
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Armament Research,
Development, and Engineering Center
ATTN: SMCAR-TD, Jim Killen
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Armament Research,
Development, and Engineering Center
ATTN: SMCAR-TDS, Vic Lindner
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
- 1 Commander
Belvoir Research, Development, and
Engineering Center
ATTN: STRBE-FC, Ash Patil
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5606
- 1 Commander
Belvoir Research, Development, and
Engineering Center
ATTN: STRBE-JDA, Melvin Goss
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5606

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Commander, USACECOM
R&D Technical Library
ATTN: ASQNC-ELC-IS-L-R, Myer Center
Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703-5000
- 1 Commander
Combined Arms Combat Development
ATTN: ATZL-CAP, LTC Morrison
Director, Surv Task Force
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-5300
- 1 Commander
Combined Arms Combat Development
ATTN: ATZL-HFM, Dwain Skelton
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-5300
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Foreign Science and Technology
Center
ATTN: AIAF, Bill Rich
220 Seventh St., NE
Charlottesville, VA 22901-5396
- 3 Commander
U.S. Army Foreign Science and Technology
Center
ATTN: AIAFRC,
T. Walker
S. Eitleman
R. Witnebal
220 Seventh St., NE
Charlottesville, VA 22901-5396
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Foreign Science and Technology
Center
ATTN: AIFRS, Gordon Spencer
220 Seventh St., NE
Charlottesville, VA 22901-5396
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Foreign Science and Technology
Center
ATTN: AIAFRT, John Koseiewicz
220 Seventh St., NE
Charlottesville, VA 22901-5396

No. of Copies	Organization
1	Commander U.S. Army Foreign Science and Technology Center ATTN: AIFRC, Dave Hardin 220 Seventh St., NE Charlottesville, VA 22901-5396
1	Commander U.S. Army Foreign Science and Technology Center ATTN: AMXST-WSI, John R. Aker 220 Seventh St., NE Charlottesville, VA 22901-5396
1	Commander U.S. Army Harry Diamond Laboratories ATTN: SLCHD-RT, Peter Johnson 2800 Powder Mill Road Adelphi, MD 20783-1197
1	Commander U.S. Army INSCOM ATTN: IAOPS-SE-M, George Maxfield Arlington Hall Station Arlington, VA 22212-5000
1	Commander U.S. Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-RD-GC-T, R. Alongi Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5000
1	Commander U.S. Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-RD-SS-AT, Ed Vaughn Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5000
1	Commander U.S. Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-RD, J. Bradas Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5000
2	Commander U.S. Army Missile Command ATTN: SFAE-ASM-LS-E, Mr. Supko Mr. Purue Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-8051

No. of Copies	Organization
1	Commander U.S. Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-YTSD, Glenn Allison Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5070
1	Commander U.S. Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-REX, W. Pittman Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5500
1	Commander U.S. Army Natick R&D Center ATTN: STRNC-OI, Stephen A. Freitas Natick, MA 01760
1	Commander U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command ATTN: SPAE-ASM-PEO, COL Don Derrah Warren, MI 48397-5000
1	Commander U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command ATTN: AMSTA-CF, Dr. Oscar Warren, MI 48090
1	Commander U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command ATTN: AMSTA-CK, M. Erickson Warren, MI 48090-5000
1	Commander U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command ATTN: AMSTA-CR, Mr. Wheelock Warren, MI 48397-5000
1	Commander U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command ATTN: AMSTA-CV, COL Kearney Warren, MI 48397-5000
2	Commander U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command ATTN: AMSTA-NKS, D. Cyaye J. Rowe Warren, MI 48397-5000

No. of
Copies Organization

- 2 Commander
U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command
ATTN: AMSTA-RGE,
R. Munt
R. McClelland
Warren, MI 48397-5000
- 2 Commander
U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command
ATTN: AMSTA-RSC,
John Bennett
Wally Mick
Warren, MI 48397-5000
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command
ATTN: SFAE-ASM-SS-T,
Mr. Rzyzi
Warren, MI 48397-5000
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command
ATTN: AMSTA-RSK, Sam Goodman
Warren, MI 48090-5000
- 1 Office of the PEO, Armored Sys Mod
ATTN: SFAE-ASM-CV, Brian Bonkosky
Warren, MI 48090-5000
- 6 Commander
U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command
ATTN: AMSTA-ZE, R. Asoklis
AMSTA-ZEA,
C. Robinson
R. Gonzalez
AMSTA-ZS, D. Peas
AMSTA-ZSS,
J. Thompson
J. Soltez
Warren, MI 48397-5000
- 1 Commander
HQ, TRAC RPD
ATTN: Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff
for Combat Operations
Fort Monroe, VA 23651-5000

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Assistant Director, Research and
Development Directorate
ATTN: Mr. B. Benn
20 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20314-1000
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Operational Test and Evaluation
Agency
ATTN: MG Stephenson
4501 Ford Ave.
Alexandria, VA 22302-1458
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Vulnerability Assessment
Laboratory
ATTN: SLCVA-CF, Gil Apodaca
White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002-5513
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Operational Test and Evaluation
Agency
ATTN: LTC Gordon Crupper
4501 Ford Ave., # 870
Alexandria, VA 22302-1435
- 1 Director
TRAC-WSMR
ATTN: ATRC-RD, McCoy
White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002-5502
- 2 U.S. General Accounting Office
Program Evaluation and Methodology Division
ATTN: Robert G. Orwin
Joseph Sonnefeld
Room 5844
441 G St., NW
Washington, DC 20548
- 1 Director
U.S. Army Model Improvement and Study
Management Agency
ATTN: SFUS-MIS, Eugene P. Visco
Room L101
1900 Half St., SW
Washington, DC 20324

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Director
U.S. Army Industrial Base Engineering Activity
ATTN: AMXIB-MT
Rock Island, IL 61299-7260
- 1 Director
U.S. Army Industrial Base Engineering Activity
ATTN: AMXIB-PS, Steve McGlone
Rock Island, IL 61299-7260
- 3 Director
U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment
Station
ATTN: WESEN,
Dr. V. LaGarde
Mr. W. Grabau
WESEN-C, Mr. David Meeker
P.O. Box 631
Vicksburg, MS 39180-0631
- 1 U.S. Army Engineer Topographic Laboratories
ATTN: Technical Director, W. Boge
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5546
- 1 Director
U.S. Army Survivability Management Office
ATTN: SLCSM-C31, H. J. Davis
2800 Powder Mill Road
Adelphi, MD 20783
- 1 Director
U.S. Army Survivability Mangement Office
ATTN: SLCSM-D, COL H. Head
2800 Powder Mill Road
Adelphi, MD 20783-1145
- 3 Director
U.S. Army Research Office
ATTN: SLCRO-MA,
Dr. J. Chandra
Dr. K. Clark
Dr. Wu
P.O. Box 12211
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2211

No. of
Copies Organization

- 3 Director
Center for Night Vision and Electro-Optics
ATTN: AMSEL-NV-V,
John Palmer
John Ho
DELMV-L, Dr. R. Buser
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5677
- 7 Director
U.S. Army Missile and Space Intelligence
Center
ATTN: AliviS-RT, Pat Jordan
AIMS-YLD, Vernon L. Stallcup
AIMS-YRS,
Thomas Blalock
Pete Kirkland
AIMS-YRT,
Francis G. Cline
Don A. Slaymaker
Randy L. Smith
Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5500
- 1 Commandant
U.S. Army Logistics Management College
ATTN: AMXMC-LS-S,
CPT(P) Stephen Parker
Fort Lee, VA 23801
- 2 Director
HQ, TRAC RPD
ATTN: ATRC-RP, COL Brinkley
ATRC-RPR, Mark W. Murray
Fort Monroe, VA 23651-5143
- 1 Director
U.S. Army Cold Regions Research and
Development Laboratory
ATTN: Technical Director, Lewis Link
72 Lyme Road
Hanover, NH 03755
- 1 Chief of Naval Operations
OP-03-C2
ATTN: CPT Robert K. Barr
Room 4D537, The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20350-2000

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Commander
U.S. Naval Air Systems Command
JTCG, AS Central Office
ATTN: 5164J, LTC James B. Sebolka
Washington, DC 20361

- 1 Commander
U.S. Naval Ocean Systems Center
ATTN: Earle G. Schweizer, Code 000
San Diego, CA 92151-5000

- 4 Commander
U.S. Naval Surface Warfare Center
ATTN: Code G13,
Gregory J. Budd
James Ellis
Barbara J. Harris
Constance P. Rollins
Dahlgren, VA 22448-5000

- 2 Commander
U.S. Naval Weapons Center
ATTN: Code 3951,
Jay Butterworth
Dr. Helen Wang
Bldg. 1400, Room B20
China Lake, CA 93555

- 3 Commander
U.S. Naval Weapons Center
ATTN: Mark D. Alexander, Code 3894
Melvin H. Keith, Code 39104
Robert Cox, Code 3517
China Lake, CA 93555-6001

- 2 Commander
U.S. Naval Weapons Center
ATTN: Code 3386,
Tim Horton
Dave Hall
China Lake, CA 93555

- 1 Commander
U.S. Naval Civil Eng Laboratories
ATTN: John M. Ferritto, Code L53
Port Hueneme, CA 93043

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Commander
Intelligence Threat Analysis Center
ATTN: PSD-GAS, John Bickle
Washington Navy Yard
Washington, DC 20374

- 1 Commander
Intelligence Threat Analysis Center
ATTN: Bill Davies
Washington Navy Yard, Bldg. 203, Stop 314
Washington, DC 20374-2136

- 1 Commander
Intelligence Threat Analysis Center
ATTN: Ron Demeter
Washington Navy Yard, Bldg 213, Stop 314
Washington, DC 20374-2136

- 1 Commander
Intelligence Threat Analysis Center
ATTN: Tim Finnegan
Washington Navy Yard, B-213
Washington, DC 20374

- 2 Commander
David W. Taylor Naval Ship and Development
Center
ATTN: W. Conley
J. Schot
Bethesda, MD 20084

- 1 Naval Postgraduate School
Department of Computer Science
ATTN: Dr. Michael J. Zyda, Code 52
Monterey, CA 93943-5000

- 1 Naval Postgraduate School
Department of National Security
ATTN: Dr. Joseph Sternberg, Code 73
Monterey, CA 93943

- 1 Naval Postgraduate School
Department of Aeronautics and
Astronautics
ATTN: Prof. Robert E. Ball
Monterey, CA 93943

No. of
Copies Organization

2 Booz-Allen and Hamilton, Inc.
ATTN: John M. Vice (2 cps)
WRDC/FIVS/SURVIAC
Bldg. 45, Area B
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433-6553

1 Commander
Eglin Air Force Base
AD/ENL
ATTN: Robert L. Stovall
Eglin AFB, FL 32542

1 Commander
USAF HQ ESD/PLEA
Chief, Engineering and Test Division
ATTN: Paul T. Courtoglous
Hanscom AFB, MA 01730

1 Commander
HQ AFOTEC/XJP
ATTN: LTC Richard Harris
Kirtland AFB, NM 87117-7001

2 Commander
AFATL
ATTN: AGA,
Lawrence Jones
Mickie Phipps
Eglin AFB, FL 32542-5434

1 Commander
ATTN: AFEWC/SAXE, Bob Eddy
Kelly AFB, TX 78243-5000

1 Commander
AFWAL/AARA
ATTN: Ed Zelano
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433

1 Commander
AFWAL/FIES
ATTN: James Hodges, Sr.
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433-6523

2 Commander
AFWAL/MLTC
ATTN: LT Robert Carringer
Dave Judson
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433-6533

No. of
Copies Organization

1 Commander
ASB/XRM
ATTN: Gerald Bennett
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433

1 Commander
WRDC/AARA
ATTN: Michael L. Bryant
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433

1 Commander
FTD/SDMBA
ATTN: Charles Darnell
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433

1 Commander
FTD/SDMBU
ATTN: Kevin Nelson
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433

1 Commander
FTD/SQDRA
ATTN: Greg Koesters
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433-6508

1 Commander
FTD
ATTN: Tom Reinhardt
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433

1 Commander
FTD/SDAEA
ATTN: Joe Sugrue
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433

1 Commander
AFWAL/AARA
ATTN: Vincent Velten
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433

1 Commander
FTD/SQDRA
ATTN: Larry E. Wright
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433

1 Commander
AD/CZL
ATTN: James M. Heard
Eglin AFB, FL 32542-5000

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Commander
AD/ENY
ATTN: Dr. Stewart W. Turner,
Director of Engineering Analysis
Eglin AFB, FL 32542-5000
- 2 Commander
AD/ENYW
ATTN: 2LT Michael Ferguson
Jim Richardson
Eglin AFB, FL 32542-5000
- 1 Commander
Air Force Armament Laboratory
ATTN: AFATL/DLY, James B. Flint
Eglin AFB, FL 32542-5000
- 1 Department of Commerce
National Bureau of Standards
Manufacturing Systems Group
ATTN: B. Smith
Washington, DC 20234
- 2 Air Force Wright Aeronautical Labs
ATTN: CDJ,
CPT Jost
Joseph Faison
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433-6523
- 1 Battelle
ATTN: TACTEC Library, J. N. Huggins
505 King Ave.
Columbus, OH 43201-2693
- 1 Battelle Research Laboratory
ATTN: Bernard J. Tullington
1300 N. 17th St., Suite 1520
Arlington, VA 22209
- 1 Director
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
ATTN: Mark Wilkins
P.O. Box 808, L-3321
Livermore, CA 94551

No. of
Copies Organization

- 3 Los Alamos National Laboratory
ATTN: MS 985, Dean C. Nelson
MS F600, Gary Tietgen
MS G787, Terrence Phillips
P.O. Box 1663
Los Alamos, NM 87545
- 1 Los Alamos National Laboratory
ATTN: MS F681, LTC Michael V. Ziehm
USMC
P.O. Box 1668
Los Alamos, NM 87545
- 1 Sandia National Laboratories
Department 913
ATTN: Ron Andreas
Albuquerque, NM 87185-5800
- 1 Sandia National Laboratories
Division 1611
ATTN: Tom James
Albuquerque, NM 87185
- 1 Sandia National Laboratories
Division 1623
ATTN: Larry Hostettler
Albuquerque, NM 87185
- 1 Sandia National Laboratories
ATTN: Gary W. Richter
P.O. Box 969
Livermore, CA 94550
- 2 Lincoln Laboratory
MIT
ATTN: Dr. Robert Shin
Dr. Chuck Burt
P.O. Box 73
Lexington, MA 02173
- 3 Lincoln Laboratory
MIT
Surveillance Systems Group
ATTN: R. Barnes
G. Knittel
J. Kong
244 Wood St.
Lexington, MA 02173-0073

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 NASA-Ames Research Center
ATTN: Dr. Alex Woo
MS 227-2
Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000
- 1 NASA-Ames Research Center
ATTN: Leroy Presley
MS 227-4
Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000
- 1 Keweenaw Research Center
Michigan Technological University
ATTN: Bill Reynolds
Houghton, MI 49931
- 2 Central Intelligence Agency
ATTN: ORD/PERD,
Ray Cwiklinski
Tom Kennedy
Washington, DC 20505
- 1 Central Intelligence Agency
ATTN: ORD/IERD, J. Fleisher
Washington, DC 20505
- 1 Central Intelligence Agency
OIR/DB/Standard
GE47 HQ
Washington, DC 20505
- 2 Central Intelligence Agency
ATTN: OIA,
Barbara A. Kroggel
Monica McGuinn
WASH DC 20505
- 1 Central Intelligence Agency
ATTN: ORD, Peter Lew
1820 N. Fort Myer Drive
Arlington, VA 22209
- 6 Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA)
ATTN: Mr. Irwin A. Kaufman
Mr. Arthur O. Kresse
Mr. Arthur Stein
Dr. Lowell Tonnessen
Mr. Benjamin W. Turner
Ms. Sylvia L. Waller
1801 N. Beauregard St.
Alexandria, VA 22311

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Institute for Defense Analyses
ATTN: Carl F. Kossack
1005 Athens Way
Sun City, FL 33570
- 1 Denver Research Institute
Target Vulnerability and Survivability
Laboratory
ATTN: Lawrence G. Ulliyatt
P.O. Box 10127
Denver, CO 80210
- 1 Denver Research Institute
University of Denver
ATTN: Louis E. Smith
University Park
Denver, CO 80208
- 1 California Institute of Technology
Jet Propulsion Laboratory
ATTN: D. Lewis
4800 Oak Grove Drive
Pasadena, CA 91109
- 3 Southwest Research Institute
ATTN: Martin Goland
Alex B. Wenzel
Patrick H. Zabel
P.O. Drawer 28255
San Antonio, TX 78228-0255
- 1 Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State
University
Industrial Engineering Operations Research
Department
ATTN: Robert C. Williges
302 Whittemore Hall
Blacksburg, VA 24061-8603
- 1 Georgia Technical Research Institute
Systems and Technical Laboratory
ATTN: Dr. Charles Watt
1770 Richardsons Road
Smyrna, GA 30080

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Georgia Institute of Technology
ATTN: Dr. Richard Moore
ECSL/EME
ERB Bldg., Room 111
Atlanta, GA 30332
- 1 Virginia Technological Institute
Electrical Engineering Department
ATTN: Dr. David de Wolf
340 Wittemore Hall
Blacksburg, VA 24061
- 1 Auburn University
Electrical Engineering Department
ATTN: Dr. Thomas Shumpert
Auburn University, AL 36849
- 1 University of Dayton
Graduate Engineering and Research
Kettering Lab 262
ATTN: Dr. Gary Thiele, Director
Dayton, OH 45469
- 1 Drexel University
ATTN: Dr. Pei Chi Chou
College of Engineering
Philadelphia, PA 19104
- 1 Oklahoma State University
College of Engineering, Architecture,
and Technology
ATTN: Thomas M. Browder, Jr.
P.O. Box 1925
Eglin AFB, FL 32542
- 1 Princeton University
Mathematics Department
Fine Hall
Washington Road
ATTN: John Tukey
Princeton, NJ 08544-1000
- 2 Stanford University, Star Laboratory
ATTN: Dr. Joseph W. Goodman
Dr. John F. Vesecky
Electrical Engineering Department
233 Durand Building
Stanford, CA 94305-4055

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 University of Idaho
Department of Civil Engineering
ATTN: Dr. Dennis R. Horn, Assistant Professor
Moscow, ID 83843-4194
- 1 University of Illinois at Chicago
Communications Laboratory
ATTN: Dr. Wolfgang-M. Boerner
P.O. Box 4348
M/C 154, 1141-SEO
Chicago, IL 60680
- 1 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Department of Civil Engineering and
Environmental Studies
ATTN: Dr. E. Downey Brill, Jr.
208 North Romine
Urbana, IL 61801-2374
- 1 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Department of Electrical and Computer
Engineering
ATTN: Dr. Shung-Wu Lee
1406 W. Green
Urbana, IL 61801
- 1 The Johns Hopkins University
Applied Physics Laboratory
ATTN: Johnathan Fluss
Johns Hopkins Road
Laurel, MD 20707
- 1 University of Nevada
Environmental Research Center
ATTN: Dr. Delbert S. Barth, Senior Scientist
Las Vegas, NV 89154-0001
- 1 University of North Carolina
ATTN: Professor Henry Fuchs
208 New West Hall (035A)
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
- 3 Ohio State University
Electroscience Laboratory
ATTN: Dr. Ronald Marhefka
Dr. Edward H. Newman
Dr. Prasbhaker H. Pathak
1320 Kinnear Road
Columbus, OH 43212

<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	University of Rochester College of Engineering and Applied Science ATTN: Nicholas George Rochester, NY 14627
3	University of Utah Computer Science Department ATTN: R. Riesenfeld E. Cohen L. Knapp 3160 Merrill Engineering Bldg. Salt Lake City, UT 84112
3	University of Washington 409 Department of Electrical Engineering, FT-10 ATTN: Dr. Irene Peden Dr. Akira Ishimaru Dr. Chi Ho Chan Seattle, WA 98105
1	Duke University Department of Computer Science, VLSI Raycasting ATTN: Dr. Gershon Kedem 236 North Building Durham, NC 27706
1	Gettysburg College Box 405 Gettysburg, PA 17325
1	American Defense Preparedness Association (ADPA) ATTN: Bill King 1700 N. Moore St., #900 Arlington, VA 22209-1942
1	AAI Corporation ATTN: H. W. Schuette P.O. Box 126 Hunt Valley, MD 21030-0126
1	The Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association ATTN: Kirby Lamar, BG (Ret) 4400 Fair Lakes Court Fairfax, VA 22033-3899

<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
2	Aero Corporation ATTN: David S. Eccles Gregg Snyder P.O. Box 92957, M4/913 Los Angeles, CA 90009
1	AFELM, The Rand Corporation ATTN: Library-D 1700 Main St. Santa Monica, CA 90406
1	Alliant Techsystems, Inc. ATTN: Hatem Nasr Systems and Research Center 3660 Technology Drive P.O. Box 1361 Minneapolis, MN 55418
1	Alliant Techsystems, Inc. ATTN: Fred J. Parduhn 7225 Northland Drive Brooklyn Park, MN 55428
2	Alliant Techsystems, Inc. ATTN: Raymond H. Burg Laura C. Dillway MN38-4000 10400 Yellow Circle Drive Minnetonka, MN 55343
1	Allison Gas Turbine Division of GM ATTN: Michael Swift P.O. Box 420, SC S22B Indianapolis, IN 46260-0420
1	Aluminum Company of America ATTN: Frank W. Baker Alcoa Technical Center Alcoa Center, PA 15069
1	ANSER ATTN: James W. McNulty 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, VA 22202

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 ARC C-500
 ATTN: John H. Bucher
 Modena Road
 Coatesville, PA 19320
- 1 Armament Systems, Inc.
 ATTN: Gerard Zeller
 P.O. Box 158
 211 West Bel Air Ave.
 Aberdeen, MD 21001
- 1 Armored Vehicle Technologies
 ATTN: Coda M. Edwards
 P.O. Box 2057
 Warren, MI 48090
- 1 ASI Systems, International
 ATTN: Dr. Michael Stamatelatos
 3319 Lone Jack Road
 Encinitas, CA 92024
- 1 A. W. Bayer and Associates
 ATTN: Albert W. Bayer, President
 Marina City Club
 4333 Admiralty Way
 Marina del Rey, CA 90292-5469
- 1 The BDM Corporation
 ATTN: Edwin J. Dorchak
 7915 Jones Branch Drive
 McLean, VA 22102-3396
- 1 The BDM Corporation
 ATTN: Fred J. Michel
 1300 N. 17th St.
 Arlington, VA 22209
- 1 Bell Helicopter, Textron
 ATTN: Jack R. Johnson
 P.O. Box 482
 Fort Worth, TX 76101
- 3 BMY, Division of Harsco
 ATTN: William J. Wagner, Jr.
 Ronald W. Jenkins
 Ed Magalski
 P.O. Box 1512
 York, PA 17404

No. of
Copies Organization

- 2 Boeing Aerospace
 ATTN: Dr. Robert Chiavetta
 Dr. John Kuras
 MS 8K17,
 P.O. Box 3999
 Seattle, WA 98124-2499
- 2 Boeing Corporation
 ATTN: MS 33-04, Robert Bristow
 MS 48-88, Wayne Hammond
 P.O. Box 3707
 Seattle, WA 98124-2207
- 1 Boeing Vertol Company
 A Division of Boeing Co.
 ATTN: MS P30-27, John E. Lyons
 P.O. Box 16858
 Philadelphia, PA 19142
- 1 General Dynamics Land Systems
 ATTN: Jay A. Lobb
 P.O. Box 2074, Mail Zone 436-21-19
 Warren, MI 48090-2074
- 1 Booz-Allen and Hamilton, Inc.
 ATTN: Dr. Richard B. Benjamin
 Suite 131, 4141 Colonel Glenn Highway
 Dayton, OH 45431
- 1 Booz-Allen and Hamilton, Inc.
 ATTN: Lee F. Mallett
 1300 N. 17th St., Suite 1610
 Rosslyn, VA 22209
- 1 John Brown Associates
 ATTN: Dr. John A. Brown
 P.O. Box 145
 Berkeley Heights, NJ 07922-0145
- 1 Chamberlain
 ATTN: Mark A. Sackett
 P.O. Box 2545
 Waterloo, IA 50704
- 1 Computer Sciences Corporation
 200 Sparkman Drive
 Huntsville, AL 35805

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Cray Research, Inc.
ATTN: William W. Kritlow
P.O. Box 151
Huntington Beach, CA 92648-0151
- 1 CRS Serrine, Inc.
ATTN: Dr. James C. Smith
P.O. Box 22427
1177 West Loop South
Houston, TX 77227
- 1 CSC
ATTN: Abner W. Lee
200 Sparkman Drive
Huntsville, AL 35805
- 2 Cypress International
ATTN: August J. Caponecchi
James Logan
1201 E. Abingdon Drive
Alexandria, VA 22314
- 1 DATA Networks, Inc.
ATTN: William E. Regan, Jr., President
288 Greenspring Station
Brooklandville, MD 21022
- 1 Datatec, Inc.
ATTN: Donald E. Cudney, President
326 Green Acres
Fort Walton Beach, FL 32548
- 1 Delco Systems Operation
ATTN: John Steen
6767 Hollister Ave., #P202
Goleta, CA 93117
- 1 Dow Chemical, U.S.A.
ATTN: Dr. P. Richard Stoesser
Contract R&D
1801 Building
Midland, MI 48674-1801
- 1 DuPont Company FPD
ATTN: Dr. Oswald R. Bergmann
Bldg. 1246, 1007 Market St.
Wilmington, DE 19898

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Dynamics Analysis and Test Associates
ATTN: Dr. C. Thomas Savell
2231 Faraday Ave.
Suite 103
Carlsbad, CA 92008
- 1 E. I. DuPont Ted FMC
ATTN: Richard O. Myers, Jr.
Wilmington, DE 19898
- 1 Eichelberger Consulting Company
ATTN: Dr. Robert Eichelberger, President
409 West Catherine St.
Bel Air, MD 21014
- 1 Electronic Warfare Associates, Inc.
ATTN: William V. Chiaramonte
2071 Chain Bridge Road
Vienna, VA 22180
- 1 Emprise, Ltd.
ATTN: Bradshaw Armendt, Jr.
201 Crafton Road
Bel Air, MD 21014
- 1 E-OIR Measurements, Inc.
ATTN: Russ Moulton
P.O. Box 1240
Spotsylvania, VA 22553-1240
- 9 Environmental Research Institute of
Michigan (ERIM)
ATTN: Dr. Stephen R. Stewart
Dr. K. Augustyn
Dr. D. Ausherman
Dr. I. LaHaie
Dr. C. L. Arnold
Mr. M. Bair
Mr. R. Horvath
Mr. B. Morey
Mr. M. Walsh
P.O. Box 134001
Ann Arbor, MI 48113-4001

No. of
Copies Organization

- 3 FMC Corporation
ATTN: Ronald S. Beck
Martin Lim
Jacob F. Yacoub
881 Martin Ave.
Santa Clara, CA 95052
- 3 FMC Corporation
Advanced Systems Center (ASC)
ATTN: Edward Berry
Scott L. Langlie
Herb Theumer
1300 South Second St.
P.O. Box 59043
Minneapolis, MN 55459
- 2 FMC Corporation
Defense Systems Group
ATTN: Robert Burt
Dennis R. Nitschke
1115 Coleman Ave.
San Jose, CA 95037
- 1 FMC Naval Systems Division
ATTN: Randall Ellis, MK-45
1300 South Second St.
Minneapolis, MN 55459-0043
- 1 FMC Corporation
Northern Ordnance Division
ATTN: M3-11, Barry Brown
4800 East River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55421
- 7 FMC Corporation
Ordnance Engineering Division
ATTN: H. Croft
M. Hatcher
L. House
J. Jackson
E. Maddox
R. Musante
S. Kraus
1105 Coleman Ave., Box 1201
San Jose, CA 95108

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 GE Aircraft Engines
ATTN: Dr. Roger B. Dunn
One Neumann Way, MD J185
Cincinnati, OH 45215-6301
- 1 General Atomics
ATTN: Chester J. Everline, Staff Engineer
P.O. Box 85608
San Diego, CA 92138-5608
- 1 General Dynamics
ATTN: Dr. Fred Cleveland
P.O. Box 748
Mail Zone 5965
Fort Worth, TX 76101
- 3 General Dynamics
ATTN: MZ-4362112, Robert Carter
MZ-4362029, Jim Graciano
MZ-4362055, Gary Jackman
38500 Mound
Sterling Heights, MI 48310
- 3 General Dynamics Corporation
ATTN: MZ-2650, Dave Bergman
MZ-2860, John Romanko
MZ-2844, Cynthia Waters
P.O. Box 748
Fort Worth, TX 76101-0748
- 1 General Dynamics Land Systems
ATTN: Dr. Paulus Kersten
P.O. Box 1901
Warren, MI 48090
- 1 General Dynamics Land Systems
ATTN: William M. Mrdeza
P.O. Box 2045
Warren, MI 48090
- 5 General Dynamics Land Systems
ATTN: Richard Auyer
Otto Renius
N. S. Sridharan
Dean R. Loftin
Dr. Phil Lett
P.O. Box 2074
Warren, MI 48090-2074

No. of
Copies Organization

- 3 General Motors Corporation
Research Laboratories
ATTN: J. Boyse
J. Joyce
R. Sarraga
Warren, MI 48090
- 1 General Motors Corporation
Military Vehicles Operations
Combat Vehicle Center
ATTN: Dr. John A. MacBain
P.O. Box 420, Mail Code 01
Indianapolis, IN 46206-0420
- 1 Grumman Aerospace Corporation
Research and Development Center
ATTN: Dr. Robert T. Brown,
Senior Research Scientist
Bethpage, NY 11714
- 1 GTRI-RAIL-MAD
ATTN: Mr. Joe Bradley
CRB 577
Atlanta, GA 30332
- 2 INEL/EG&G
Engineer Lab
ATTN: Ray Berry
M. Marx Hintze
P.O. Box 1625
Idaho Falls, ID 83451
- 1 Interactive Computer Graphics Center
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
ATTN: M. Wozny
Troy, NY 12181
- 1 International Development Corporation
ATTN: Trevor O. Jones, President
One Cleveland Center, Suite 2900
1375 East Ninth St.
Cleveland, OH 44114-1724
- 1 ISAT
ATTN: Roderick Briggs
1305 Duke St.
Alexandria, VA 22314

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Kaman Sciences Corporation
ATTN: Timothy S. Pendergrass
600 Blvd. South, Suite 208
Huntsville, AL 35802
- 1 Ketron, Inc.
ATTN: Robert S. Bennett
901 Dulaney Valley Road, Suite 220
Baltimore, MD 21204-2600
- 1 Lanxido Armor Products
ATTN: Dr. Robert A. Wolffe
Tralee Industrial Park
Newark, DE 19711
- 1 Lockheed Corporation
ATTN: R. C. Smith
Burbank, CA 91520
- 3 Lockheed-California Company
ATTN: C. A. Burton
R. J. Ricci
M. Steinberg
Burbank, CA 91520
- 2 Lockheed-Georgia Company
ATTN: Ottis F. Teuton
J. Tulkoff
Dept. 72-91, Zone 419
Marietta, GA 30063
- 1 Logistics Management Institute
ATTN: Edward D. Simms, Jr.
6400 Goldsboro Road
Bethesda, MD 20817-5886
- 1 Los Alamos Technical Associates, Inc.
ATTN: Jon Davis
6501 Americas Parkway, #900
Albuquerque, NM 87110
- 1 LTV Aerospace and Defense Company
ATTN: Daniel M. Reedy
P.O. Box 655907
Dallas, TX 75265-5907

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 LTV Aircraft Products Group
ATTN: Paul T. Chan, M/S 194-63
P.O. Box 655907
Dallas, TX 75265-5907

- 3 Martin Marietta Aerospace
ATTN: MP-113, Dan Dorfman
MP-433, Richard S. Dowd
MP-243, Thomas C. D'Isepo
P.O. Box 555837
Orlando, FL 32855-5837

- 3 Mathematical Applications Group, Inc.
ATTN: M. Cohen
R. Goldstein
H. Steinberg
3 Westchester Plaza
Elmsford, NY 10523

- 1 Maxwell Laboratories, Inc.
ATTN: Dr. Michael Holland
8888 Balboa Ave.
San Diego, CA 92123-1506

- 1 McDonnell Douglas Astronautic
ATTN: Nikolai A. Louie
5301 Bolsa Ave.
Huntington Beach, CA 92647

- 1 McDonnell Douglas, Inc.
ATTN: David Hamilton
P.O. Box 516
St. Louis, MO 63166

- 1 McDonnell Douglas, Inc.
ATTN: Alan R. Parker
3855 Lakewood Blvd., MC 35-18
Long Beach, CA 90846

- 1 Memex Corporation
ATTN: Charles S. Smith
9 Doaks Lane
Marblehead, MA 01945

- 1 Micro Electronics of North Carolina
ATTN: Gershon Kedem
P.O. Box 12889
Research Triangle Park, NC 07709

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 MIT
ATTN: Dr. S. Benton
RE15-416
Cambridge, MA 02139

- 6 The MITRE Corporation
ATTN: Edward C. Brady, Vice President
Dr. Robert Henderson
Dr. Nicklas Gramenopoulos
Dr. Narayana Srinivasan
Norman W. Huddy
Dr. John M. Ruddy
7525 Colshire Drive
McLean, VA 22102-3184

- 1 NAVIR DEVCON
ATTN: Frank Wenograd, Code 6043
Walminstor, PA 18974

- 1 North Aircraft
ATTN: Dr. Athanosis Varvatsis
Mail Zone 3622/84
1 Northrop Ave.
Hawthorne, CA 90250

- 1 Northrop Corporation
Research and Technology Center
ATTN: James R. Reis
One Research Park
Palos Verdes Peninsula, CA 90274

- 1 Norton Company
ATTN: Ronald K. Bart
1 New Bond St.
Worcester, MA 01606-2698

- 1 The Oceanus Company
ATTN: RADM Robert H. Gormley, (Ret)
P.O. Box 7069
Menlo Park, CA 94026

- 1 Pacific Scientific/Htl Division
ATTN: Robert F. Aldrich
1800 Highland Ave.
Duarte, CA 91010

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Perceptronics, Inc.
ATTN: Dean R. Loftin
21111 Erwin St.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

- 1 PRI, Inc.
ATTN: W. Bushell
Bldg. E4435, Second Floor
Edgewood Area-APG, MD 21010

- 1 RGB Associates, Inc.
ATTN: R. Barakat
Box B
Wayland, MA 01778

- 1 Rockwell International Corporation
ATTN: Dr. H. Bran Tran
P.O. Box 92098
Department 113/GB01
Los Angeles, CA 90009

- 1 Rockwell International Corporation
ATTN: Keith R. Rathjen, Vice President
3370 Miraloma Ave. (031-HA01)
Anaheim, CA 92803-3105

- 1 Rome Air Development Center
ATTN: RADC/IRRE, Peter J. Costianes
Griffis Air Force Base, NY 13441-5700

- 1 Rome Air Development Center
ATTN: RADC/OCTM,
Edward Starczewski
Bldg. 106
Griffis Air Force Base, NY 13441-5700

- 1 S-Cubed
ATTN: Michael S. Lancaster
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 420
Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 Sachs/Freeman Associates, Inc.
ATTN: Donald W. Lynch,
Senior Research Physicist
205 Yoakum Parkway, #511
Alexandria, VA 22304

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 SAIC
ATTN: Dr. Alan J. Toepfer
2301 Yale Blvd., SE
Albuquerque, NM 87106

- 1 SAIC
ATTN: John H. McNeilly, Senior Scientist
1710 Goodridge Drive
McLean, VA 22102

- 2 SAIC
ATTN: Terry Keller
Robert Turner
Suite 200
1010 Woodman Drive
Dayton, OH 45432

- 1 SAIC
ATTN: David R. Garfinkle
Malibu Canyon Business Park
26679 W. Agoura Road, Suite 200
Calabasas, CA 91302

- 1 Sidwell-Ross and Associates, Inc.
ATTN: LTG Marion C. Ross, (USA Ret),
Executive Vice President
P.O. Box 88531
Atlanta, GA 30338

- 1 Sigma Research, Inc.
ATTN: Dr. Richard Bossi
4014 Hampton Way
Kent, WA 98032

- 1 Simula, Inc.
ATTN: Joseph W. Coltman
10016 S. 51st St.
Phoenix, AZ 85044

- 1 SimTech
ATTN: Dr. Annie V. Saylor
3307 Bob Wallace Ave., Suite 4
Huntsville, AL 35807

- 1 Alan Smolen and Associates, Inc.
ATTN: Alan Smolen, President
One Cynthia Court
Palm Coast, FL 32027-8172

No. of
Copies Organization

- 3 Sparta, Inc.
ATTN: David M. McKinley
Robert E. O'Connor
Karen M. Rooney
4901 Corporate Drive
Huntsville, AL 35805-6201
- 1 SRI International
ATTN: Donald R. Curran
333 Ravenswood Ave.
Menlo Park, CA 94025
- 3 Structural Dynamics Research Corporation
(SDRC)
ATTN: R. Ard
W. McClelland
J. Osborn
2000 Eastman Drive
Milford, OH 45150
- 1 Syracuse Research Group
ATTN: Dr. Chung-Chi Cha
Merrill Lane
Syracuse, NY 13210
- 1 System Planning Corporation
ATTN: Ann Hafer
1500 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22209
- 1 XMCO, Inc.
460 Spring Park Pl #1500
Herndon, VA 22070-5215
- 1 XONTECH
ATTN: John Dagostino
1501 Wilson Blvd. #902
Arlington, VA 22209
- 1 Zernow Tech Services, Inc.
ATTN: Dr. Louis Zernow
425 West Bonita, Suite 208
San Dimas, CA 91773
- 2 SURVICE Engineering
ATTN: Jim Foulk
George Lard
1003 Old Philadelphia Road
Aberdeen, MD 21001

No. of
Copies Organization

- 2 Sverdrup Technology
ATTN: Dr. Ralph Calhoun
Bud Gruenning
P.O. Box 1935
Eglin AFB, FL 32542
- 1 Mr. Michael W. Bernhardt,
DA Consultant
Rt. 1, 12 Arthur Drive
Hockessin, DE 19707
- 1 Mr. H. G. Bowen, Jr.
DA Consultant
408 Crown View Drive
Alexandria, VA 22314-4804
- 1 Mr. Harvey E. Cale,
DA Consultant
2561 Meadowbrook Lane
Carson City, NV 89701-5726
- 1 Dr. Paul F. Carlson,
DA Consultant
11668 Tanglewood Drive
Eden Prairie, MN 55347
- 1 Mr. Abraham Golub,
DA Consultant
203 Yoakum Parkway, Apt. 607
Alexandria, VA 22304
- 1 Mr. Dave Hardison,
ASB Consultant
3807 Bent Branch Road
Falls Church, VA 22041
- 1 Mr. Thomas Hafer,
DARPA Consultant
1500 Wilson Blvd.
14th Floor
Arlington, VA 22209
- 1 Mr. William M. Hubbard,
ASB Consultant
613 Eastlake Drive
Columbia, MO 65203

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Mr. Charles E. Joachim,
DA Consultant
P.O. Box 631
Vicksburg, MS 39180
- 1 Dr. Edward R. Jones,
DA Consultant
9881 Wild Deer Road
St. Louis, MO 63124
- 1 MG Robert Kirwan (USA Ret),
DA Consultant
10213 Grovewood Way
Fairfax, VA 22032
- 1 Dir, TEXCOM FSTP
ATTN: STE-TFS-Z, Donald J. Krejcarek
Fort Sill, OK 73503-6100
- 1 Mr. Robert B. Kurtz,
DA Consultant
542 Merwins Lane
Fairfield, CT 06430-1920
- 1 Dr. Roy A. Lucht
Group M-B, MS-J960
Los Alamos, NM 87545
- 1 Mr. Donald F. Menne,
DA Consultant
617 Foxcroft Drive
Bel Air, MD 21014
- 1 MG Peter G. Olenchuk (USA Ret),
BAST Consultant
6801 Baron Road
McLean, VA 22101
- 1 Mr. Albert E. Papazoni,
DA Consultant
1600 Surrey Hill Drive
Austin, TX 78746-7338
- 1 Harry Reed, Sr.,
Battelle Consultant
138 Edmund St.
Aberdeen, MD 21001

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Mr. David L. Rigotti,
McClellan Research Consultant
127 Duncannon Road
Bel Air, MD 21014
- 1 Dr. A. E. Schmidlin,
DA Consultant
28 Highview Road
Caldwell, NJ 07006-5502
- 1 Mr. Arthur Stein,
BAST Consultant
30 Chapel Woods Court
Williamsville, NY 14221-1816
- 1 Dr. Dora Strother,
ASB Consultant
3616 Landy Lane
Fort Worth, TX 76118

No. of
Copies Organization

Aberdeen Proving Ground

- 18 Dir, USAMSAA
ATTN: AMXSY-A,
W. Clifford
J. Meredith
AMXSY-C,
A. Reid
W. Braerman
AMXSY-CR, M. Miller
AMXSY-CS,
P. Beavers
C. Cairns
D. Frederick
AMXSY-G,
J. Kramar
G. Comstock
E. Christman
L. Kravitz
AMXSY-GA, W. Brooks
AMXSY-J, A. LaGrange
AMXSY-L, J. McCarthy
AMXSY-P, J. Cullum
AMXSY-RA,
R. Scungio
M. Smith
- 4 Cdr, USATECOM
ATTN: AMSTE-CG, MG Akin
AMSTE-LFT, N. Harrington
AMSTE-CG-LF
AMSTE-TC-C, R. Cozby

USER EVALUATION SHEET/CHANGE OF ADDRESS

This laboratory undertakes a continuing effort to improve the quality of the reports it publishes. Your comments/answers below will aid us in our efforts.

1. Does this report satisfy a need? (Comment on purpose, related project, or other area of interest for which the report will be used.) _____

2. How, specifically, is the report being used? (Information source, design data, procedure, source of ideas, etc.) _____

3. Has the information in this report led to any quantitative savings as far as man-hours or dollars saved, operating costs avoided, or efficiencies achieved, etc? If so, please elaborate. _____

4. General Comments. What do you think should be changed to improve future reports? (Indicate changes to organization, technical content, format, etc.) _____

BRL Report Number BRL-MR-3930 Division Symbol _____

Check here if desire to be removed from distribution list. _____

Check here for address change. _____

Current address: Organization _____
Address _____

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Director
U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory
ATTN: SLCBR-DD-T
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL

FIRST CLASS PERMIT No 0001, APG, MD

Postage will be paid by addressee.

Director
U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory
ATTN: SLCBR-DD-T
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066



NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

